

# The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. II.—No. 20.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1861.

WHOLE NUMBER 72.

## The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above  
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

### PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals,  
Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and  
kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, du-  
ties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family,  
the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to  
God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the  
type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law;  
our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine prom-  
ises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

—Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

### THE BIBLE ABOLITIONIST.

Containing the testimony of the Scripture against Slavery, and the Scriptu-  
ral method of treating it.

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this  
word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii. 20. "All Scripture is  
given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for correction, for  
instruction in righteousness. That the man of God might be perfect, thor-  
oughly furnished unto all good works." II Tim. iii. 16, 17.

Part III.—Slaveholding brought directly to the test of the  
Bible.

#### CHAPTER VIII.

#### REVIEW OF THE DECALOGUE.

We have now examined the ten commandments, one by  
one, and find that slavery, slaveholding, and the defences  
of them are violations of each and every one of those com-  
mandments. Not only so. We have seen that slavery,  
slaveholding, and the defences of them, involve the viola-  
tion of each of those commands, in the superlative degree.  
To deny the sinfulness of slaveholding becomes equivalent,  
therefore, in effect, to a denial that any violations of the  
Decalogue are, in themselves, sinful. The denial that slave-  
holding is *malum in se*, (wrong in itself), is, hence, corrupt-  
ing and demoralizing rapidly, the public mind, in respect  
to the guilt of sin, in general, and leading the mass of the  
people to think lightly of sin, in any of its minor manifes-  
tations—for most of them, doubtless, are minor. No other  
violations of the second table of the law, (prescribing our  
duties to our fellow men) can compare with slaveholding.  
Substantially, it includes all of them. Perhaps there is no  
reflecting man, acquainted with the facts of slaveholding,  
who would not deliberately prefer, as a choice between  
evils to be inflicted on his own person and family, to hazard  
or brave all the other indignities, injuries, and outrages that  
could possibly be inflicted upon himself and his family, in  
violation of the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth  
commandments, rather than to hazard or brave the indigni-  
ties, injuries, and outrages that, in violation of those same  
commandments, would naturally come upon himself and  
family, if placed in the condition of slaves. The more ear-  
nestly this statement is reflected upon, and compared with  
the well attested facts of slavery, the more clearly and for-  
cibly will it be impressed upon the mind of the inquirer.

And, in respect to the first table of the law (prescribing  
our duties to God) it is, in principle, so "like unto" the sec-  
ond, that the statement in respect to it, must be similar.  
There is no worship of false gods or of graven images, there  
is no "bowing down to them and serving them," there is no  
irreverence toward the true God or blasphemy of him, no  
profanation of the Sabbath or of other divine institutions,  
that are more perfectly heathenizing in their character and  
tendencies, more dishonoring to God, more incompatible  
with his worship, more subversive of pure religion, more

destructive to human souls, than are the principles, usages,  
and defences of slavery and slave-holding.

The worship of the true God is the worship of the God of  
justice, equity, mercy, benevolence, purity—the loving fath-  
er of all men, "with whom there is no respect of persons"—  
the "refuge of the oppressed," their "Savior in time of trou-  
ble" who has promised to "arise and set them in safety  
from them that puff at them,"—the God who forbids all in-  
justice, oppression, and cruelty, and who 'hates robbery  
for burnt offering.' This is, distinctively, the God, the only  
God whose kingly claims, whose supreme worship, rever-  
ence, authority, and institutions are guarded in the first,  
second, third, and fourth commandments—thus guarded in  
order that man—that all men—might be delivered from  
servility to tyrants by their adoration of the one, Supreme,  
—might "obey God rather than man," might be "delivered  
from the oppression of man" and thus be enabled to 'keep'  
the divine 'precepts' (Ps. cxix. 134,) and glorify and enjoy  
his Creator.

This is the God, therefore, who, in the first as well as in  
the second table of his law, has revealed himself as the pro-  
tector of the equal rights of all men, especially of those who  
most stand in need of protection, the poorest, the most des-  
pised, the most outraged, the most defenceless, the most  
helpless.

Will any man professing to reverence and worship God,  
deny that this is a true description of his character, as he  
has revealed himself in the Decalogue and throughout the  
Scriptures?

If this then, be the God whose supreme authority is guard-  
ed by the first table of the law, and whose exclusive veneration  
and worship are therein required, it follows, or (rather,  
it is involved) that the worship of any other gods, or  
supposed God, of a different or opposite character, so far  
from being required, is forbidden, in the first and second  
commandments.

Indeed, it is in precisely this negative, this prohibitory  
form, that the commandments are moulded! "Thou shalt  
have no other gods before me"—the God of justice, of equity,  
of mercy, of purity, of impartiality, the Father of all men,  
the God of the oppressed, the hater of oppression—the on-  
ly living and real God. As to all other gods, imaginary  
Gods, having no veritable matter-of-fact existence—gods who  
are represented as being in favor of injustice, iniquity, in-  
equality, partiality, cruelty, impurity, violence, fraud, theft,  
robbery, oppression, falsehood—in one word, *slaveholding*,  
as for all these and the like of them—"thou shalt not exalt  
them in the place of Jehovah—"thou shalt not bow down  
thyself to them nor serve them"—nor the graven images of them.

Just as certainly as Jehovah, the God of the Scriptures,  
is the God of justice, righteousness, mercy, purity and pro-  
tection, just so certainly does the Decalogue forbid the wor-  
ship of any imaginary god who is represented as being the  
patron of slavery, and slaveholding. All such gods are  
*false gods*, as truly and as certainly such as if their wor-  
shippers should call them by the more appropriate names  
of Dagon, or Moloch, or Baal, which they had much better  
do, than to falsify the true God by calling them "*Jehovah*,"  
which is *his name*! It is the attributes, the character of the  
Being worshipped that determines the nature and character  
of the worship; not the letters nor the sounds employed to  
express his name. Is it blasphemy to take the letters or  
sounds properly expressive of the name of the true God, *Je-  
hovah*, (the God of justice, mercy, and purity) and apply them  
to a Being, whether real or imaginary, to whom are attri-  
buted the opposite characteristics. And the worship of such  
a being is not the worship of *Jehovah*, the true God, but only  
of a counterfeit, a cheat, to whom the name of God had  
been falsely applied.

The Decalogue, containing the commandments of God,  
enables us to determine the character of the Being by whom  
it was enacted, and to determine that he hates and forbids  
all the things that go to make up the system of Slavery  
and the characteristic usages of slaveholding.

Its prohibition of the worship of false gods, binds us,  
therefore, to reject the claims and abjure the worship of  
any pretended deity that favors slavery and slaveholding.  
And it is just as necessary for Christians to do this, as it is  
to "keep themselves from idols" and to preserve among  
themselves, their children, and the surrounding community,  
the worship of *Jehovah* the one only living and true God.  
Just as certainly as the religious community settles down  
into a belief that slaveholding is not sinful, just so certain-  
ly will it lose the knowledge and worship of the true God,  
whatever may be the letters or the sounds by which the  
object of their worship may be designated. There can be  
no more sure and direct way to displace the worship of  
the true God (the God of the Bible and of the Deca-  
logue) by the worship of false gods, or of "No God,"  
than for professors and teachers of religion to deny or  
doubt the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding. The first  
table of the law cannot be obeyed or preserved by  
those who trample upon or ignore the second. "On these  
two commandments"—not on one of them—are suspended  
"all the law and the prophets." "If a man say, I love"  
and worship "God, and hateth" or loveth not "his brother,  
he is a liar. For he that loveth not his brother whom he  
hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?  
And this commandment have we from him, that he who  
loveth God love his brother also." (I John iv: 20, 21)

There can be no genuine love to God, without love to  
man—the "love" that "worketh no ill to his neighbor" and  
can no sooner consent to his being held as a slave, than to  
being thus held, himself.

### COMPENSATION.

Mr. EDITOR. I have read with much admiration, mingled  
with regret, Gerrit Smith's powerful plea for a Per-  
sonal Liberty Law, delivered before the Judiciary Commit-  
tee of the New York Legislature. What I regret is that  
Mr. Smith should have taken occasion to advocate compen-  
sation to slaveholders, in case of emancipation. He says:

"If they will consent to emancipate their slaves, then let  
the North share with them in the present loss of emancipa-  
tion."

What does Mr. Smith mean by "the present loss of eman-  
cipation?" From such language, one might conclude that  
slaveholders, by emancipation, would lose something  
which is their own, and for which a consideration ought to  
be allowed them. But I desire to know *what* they would  
lose, which they have a right to hold, and which does not  
belong to others?

Let me illustrate by a comparison. A, encouraged and  
assisted by B, takes forcible possession of C's horse, and  
appropriates it to his own use. In consequence, C falls in-  
to the lowest poverty, and is unable to support his family in  
decency and comfort. When the wrong has been persisted  
in for years, B relents, and, without a thought of giving C  
anything for the use of the horse, proposes to pay to A, a  
part of its value, if he will restore it. By what principle  
of justice or religion can such a proposition be defended?  
I cannot see that it is warranted even by the law principle  
of "honor among thieves," for by that principle, I should  
think A, ought to make a fair estimate of his dishonest  
gain, and share it with B. But justice and right demand  
that, first of all, reparation should be made to C, and can A  
honestly take a cent, till that reparation is given? What  
would A lose, of his own, by restoring the horse? Is it not  
strange that, whenever compensation is talked of, that com-



pensation all goes to the party who is the principal in wrong, and has enjoyed all the advantages of it exclusively, while the poor victim is thought to be well enough done by, if, friendless, landless, houseless, moneyless, and dependent, he is permitted to have his liberty, with just the rags of slavery on his back?

Mr. Smith says, "The compromises proposed by politicians are dishonest and wicked, because they are between the white men of the country, at the expense of the black men of the country." How far is he from falling into the very wrong which he condemns, when he proposes giving to white men the compensation which is due alone to black men? Does Mr. Smith hope that his offer of compensation will make slaveholders willing to emancipate? Possibly, he may succeed with a few, while the principle of compensation will work like a concession of the right of property in slaves, and thus counteract that conviction of the unrighteousness of slavery, from which alone peaceful emancipation can be expected. You may soothe the consciences of slaveholders, by urging the propriety of compensation; but they have no notion, in general, of giving up the privilege of domineering and lawlessness, for money. It is surprising that an Abolitionist of Mr. Smith's mental power, should talk as if emancipation was a question between the North and the South, and as if the South would take the benefit of compensation: whereas none but slaveholders would take it, \* while the rest of the people, a majority of more than nine-tenths, would only share its burden, without having had any interest in slavery but its plague.

I. S.  
\* The pro-slavery capitalists of Wall Street, who hold bonds and mortgages on slave plantations and slaves would probably get the lion's share of it, as the same class in London and Liverpool did, when British "Compensation" was distributed. Thus encouraged, the London and Liverpool capitalists are now at work, with the aid of the *London Times*, to get up the pro-slavery sentiment again. And even Lord Brougham endorses "the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man."—EDITOR.

FROM REV. HENRY HUTCHINS.

"WHAT WILL BECOME OF OUR COUNTRY?"

This is a question which fastens itself upon every mind. Unlike the viper upon Paul's hand, it cannot be shaken off. It may be held over the fires of Patriotism, and gazed upon with political sagacity, it may be shaken again and again, with assumed giant force, but still it retains its hold, with a tenacity that defies all human effort.

How can it be otherwise? It is the result of a natural law; that of self-preservation. Philosophers, statesmen, patriots, philanthropists, and christians, are all alike, the links of an electric chain, each consciously communicating a shock to the other. Each heart thrills with the question, and there is an inward witness that all other hearts are sympathetically in union with it.

The subject may be viewed from various stand points, and there may be, as doubtless there is, diversity of opinion, but the feeling is general, and best expressed in the language,—*What will become of our country?* Doubtless many assume the functions of the prophet. There is already much prophecy. This may be right or wrong, but one thing is more than probable,—*the end is not far distant.* Events of the greatest moment are transpiring, as with lightning speed. They come upon us so suddenly that we have scarcely time to view them, much less to draw conclusions, when others of equal, if not greater importance force themselves upon the vision, so that strong men are become like astonished children, peering upon the night storm, and crying out at every succeeding flash of lightning, "*Oh there! there!*"

But it is now high time for cool reflection. We need not despise the prophets' ken, nor, at this moment, need we call it into requisition. Philosophy teaches us that the thunder and the lightning, though sustaining to each other the relation of effect and cause, are both of them effects, back of which is an adequate cause. If then our country now presents the appearance of the storm cloud, if in various parts of our social and political horizon, may be seen lurid flashes, and the tempestuous roll of angry passions, all appear to be agreed that there is back of this some great human cause. With almost common consent, it is also agreed that that cause is *American slavery.* We have now taken a step in advance. We have arrived at what is, no doubt, a philosophical conclusion. We have now accounted for what has been termed the "irrepressible conflict." What will be the result, if this conflict contin-

ues? To determine this, we require not the Urim and the Thummim. We have already more than the light of Ephodical vision. It is found in that one Scripture, "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." American slavery then is the cause of "biting and devouring one another." The result is a perfectly natural and necessary one—"consumed one of another." Have we made up our minds to this? Are we prepared for it? It is as certain as that night succeeds to day. Mark the language of Him who spake as never man spake, "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

No political intrigue, or combination, or sagacity, or forecast, or compromise, can prevent or set aside this result. It follows inevitably. It has all the force of a divine law. It is God's law, and men may as well attempt to roll back the waves of the ocean, or to set aside the government of God in the heavens, as to stop the operations of this law on the earth. Liberty and slavery are antagonisms. They cannot long co-exist. By an inevitable law, one must overbear and crush out the other. Either American slavery will destroy our common liberties—the inalienable of right of every man, or the sons of freedom with the help of God, must abolish slavery. Which shall it be?

HENRY HUTCHINS.

Prairie du Sac, Sauk Co., Wis. March 8, 1861.

FROM REV. M. THACHER.

FORT COVINGTON, Franklin Co. N. Y., }  
March 18, 1861. }

If the inclosed money reaches you, I would like a few of "Our National Charters," say one dollar's worth, including the pre-payment of postage.

I preach, proportionally, on the subject of slavery as I have ever done, in former years. Occasionally a *Democrat* gets up and walks out of Church. Republicans squirm. They are all "opposers to slavery, but men of peace and not abolitionists." "Mr. Thacher is injudicious to preach upon the subject; for it stirs up excitement." We have here some "Radicals;" and Southern secession is making more Abolitionists, than any of our Northern clergy, and the N. Y. Observer "to boot," can make pro-slavery.

Now, Bro. Goodell, I want information. Many years ago, I heard it frequently alleged that a daughter of Pres. Jefferson was sold at auction. Is there authenticity to such circumstance as a fact? If there is, and within your reach, please cite to me the authority.\*

I like your paper and wish it were twice as large. I take several publications, but the *Principia* is the only one which I read thoroughly. Other periodicals have many articles worthless; and some worse than injurious, positively wicked. But of the *Principia*, I cannot afford to lose a single paragraph. Its doctrines are essentials in morals, politics and religion; as of vital importance to the whole Christian code, as any maxims or axioms of Sir Isaac, in Mathematics.

God bless and sustain you, my Brother. You and I are getting pretty well along toward our journey's end. There is rest in heaven; and if we get there before the slave is free, that angel messenger will certainly advertise us of the Jubilee and we need not go to Boston to celebrate it. We'll stay and hear the preachers of Heaven's platform, and the music of its orchestra.

Sincerely yours for abolition, radical, immediate, universal and eternal.

M. THACHER.

\* We will give what information we can on the subject.

"A reputed daughter of Thomas Jefferson was said to have been sold in New Orleans, for one thousand dollars."—*American Slave Code*, p. 85.

The particulars went the rounds of the papers some years ago, and, we think the statement was over the signature of some Western gentleman, cognizant of the fact. Another of his daughters was said to have been among the colonists of Liberia. There is also a traditionary story of a slave son of his, who accompanied him once, when he was on his way to the seat of government. Some friend whom he met, or who travelled in his company, cautioned him to beware lest that "boy should give him the slip." "Well, let him go," said the sage of Montecello, jocosely; "the fellow has as good right to liberty, as his father." Then, at the forks of the road, Jefferson handed him some money, and bade him take good care of himself, and they parted. This story was rife, forty or fifty years ago, before the naughty aboli-

tionists had made any trouble. These stories agree with the acknowledged fact that he had a number of his reputed children on the plantation, to whom he gave their freedom. In his will he mentioned them as emancipated slaves, and most humbly beseeched the State of Virginia to allow them to reside in the State without molestation. Yet one of them seems to have been sold at New Orleans. The clause of the Will reads thus:

"I humbly and earnestly request of the Legislature of Virginia, a conformation of the bequests to these servants, with leave to remain in the State where their connections are."—*Am. Slave Code*, p. 276.—*Editor Principia*.

FROM REV. DAVID THURSTON, D. D.

LITCHFIELD CORNER, Me., Mar. 13, 1861.

My esteemed friend Goodell,—Please send me a copy of your "Our National Charters," by mail. I wish I had the means to send for one hundred. I admire the *Principia*. It ought to be read by every man in the United States. You may ask why I do not labor to extend its circulation? I am accustomed to speak of it as the best paper published on the affairs of the nation. But so many other papers are taken, the plea is, they have neither the means nor the time for another. So the good *Principia* is not taken. How large is your list of paying subscribers?

The sermons of Messrs. Bulkley and Smith, should be thrown broadcast over the country. Will the people submit to have the Constitution of the United States so spoiled, I cannot say amended, as to make slavery perpetual, according to Corwin's proposal? All in favor of such an alteration, will deserve to be made slaves themselves.

May the gracious Lord sustain and prosper you in all your arduous and responsible labors, Most truly and fraternally yours,

DAVID THURSTON.

FROM REV. DR. CHEEVER.

The following, from Dr. Cheever to Rev. Wm. S. Bell, late of Williamsburgh, now of Pittsfield, Mass., will be read with special interest, by our readers, to whom the persecution of Bro. Bell, at Williamsburgh, is already known.

EDINBURGH, Jan. 16th, 1861.

My Dear Brother.—Amidst the multitude of my correspondences and engagements I have neglected to acknowledge your most kind and valued letter of encouragement and sympathy. I pray you to pardon this delay, for it has not proceeded from any want of appreciation of your kindness, for which I desire to express to you my warmest thanks, along with my own deep sympathy with you in the trials you are enduring in consequence of your faithfulness in behalf of the enslaved. Your letter to me has been particularly valuable as a testimony, at this time, in this country, in the midst of enemies in league with the pro-slavery faction and hostility at home. Our Anti-slavery Committee here have deemed it of importance to publish the letter, and accordingly have done so, in the *Witness*, the newspaper formerly edited by the celebrated Hugh Miller. The persecution you are enduring is most shameful, but I trust in God some better thing will be provided for you in his service than the post from which they have cast you out on account of your faithfulness to the word of your divine Master. And now at this moment, more than ever, is such faithfulness needed. How dreadful is the state of things in America! It is really appalling to see the whole country as it is, in judicial blindness, giving itself up to the madness of South Carolina and permitting that State, with passions set on fire of hell, to dictate to the Union. For this seems to be the way the country is taking; submission to the will of the slave power, a consent to all the demands of slavery, rather than that the dissolution of the Union should be accomplished. So perhaps we shall see South Carolina invited back, with the privilege of dictating her own terms, amending the Constitution in behalf of slavery, and instituting a universal slave code. But God reigns, and we wait on him. Things may be better among you, at this moment, than we have feared. At any rate, our duty is plain, to proclaim the word of God against the very sin, the defence and establishment of which have brought upon us all this misery, and to do that louder and more earnestly than ever. Perhaps, out of all this confusion and war, God may speedily bring the emancipation of the slaves, the abolition of slavery. We have most fervently desired that this might be brought about by the manifest agency of his Word and

Spirit, and Well! if he in one way make a show of it, through dear brother and the few wisdom and of a sound providence are in such God in mercy and efforts of our full despotism kindness.

Bro. Goodell wish just to time of agit violence, of wrong is made holiness—great principle a free and clearly exhibit- ples—to the only safeguard they will ser and stormy s to hold up th our present dom from ab Enclosed i to get subsc should go ov

DEAR W. G. many parag ly for the Les with tears in happy tender now in the h am so sad and prize me. infected with They both ar are bent on and tyranny The case of cannot adver row and indi way, and inte compared wi comic, in the whelmingly l long—O how ease, "crucific open shame! If, as men test slavery, n obligation? Whatever control.

\* See Principia

Rev. W. G. woman runni virtue has bec the boiling se ing, composed sion. The v speech, to wh



Spirit, and by the faithfulness of his church and ministers. Well! if he pleases to bring us to repentance, it may, but in one way or another it seems as if he were now arising to make a short work with this mighty sin and the sinners in it, through their own madness. The Lord be with you, my dear brother, and sustain and comfort you, and give to you and the few comparatively who are faithful with you, the wisdom and strength, the spirit of love and of power and of a sound mind, and the protection by his own merciful providence and the guidance by his grace, of which we all are in such pressing need, in this most fearful conflict. May God in mercy spare us to see each other, and join our counsels and efforts in behalf of the enslaved, and for the deliverance of our beloved country from the grasp of this frightful despotism and impiety. With many thanks for your kindness. I am most truly yours,

GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

FROM REV. L. FOSTER.

ONARCA, IROQUOIS CO., ILL., March 13th 1861.

BRO. GOODSELL: I address this letter to you, because I wish just to bid you "God-speed" in your efforts. In this time of agitation and misrule, of false logic bravado and violence, of trembling, confusion and compromise; when wrong is made to be right, slavery to be liberty, and sin to be holiness—at such a time, it is of vast moment that the great principles of truth and righteousness, of liberty, of a free and christian government, should be clearly and forcibly exhibited. Politicians are now driven to first principles—to the great fundamental truths of Heaven, as their only safeguard. If these are held up, high, before them, they will serve as beacon-lights to guide them, on their dark and stormy sea. May you long have health and strength to hold up these truths amid the storm, and God grant that our present Executive and his counsellors many have wisdom from above, and be guided by them.

Enclosed is a dollar for the Principia. I should be glad to get subscribers for it here, and may yet do so. It should go over the land.

Yours for truth and righteousness,

L. FOSTER.

FROM REV. BERAH GREEN.

WHITESBORO, March 12, 1861.

DEAR WILLIAM GOODSELL:—I thank you for a great many paragraphs in your columns; but now, very especially for the Leader in your last number. \* I may well do so with tears in my eyes. I never expected anything of any happy tendency from the influence of the craven creature, now in the highest chair in the Republic. Not I. Yet I am so sad and indignant, when I witness what does not surprise me. The Republican party seems to be as fatally infected with atheism and misanthropy as the Democratic. They both are evidently sold to the Devil, and to the Devil are bent on going. Such a loathsome union of idiocy and tyranny!

The case of poor Lucy at Cleveland is heart-breaking. I cannot advert to it without mingled emotions: disgust, sorrow and indignation. It was a horrible outrage—every way, and intensely horrible. The account of that tragedy, compared with which the most fearful of Shakspeare, are comic, in the last Liberator (taken from the Bugle) is overwhelmingly harrowing. O Lord, righteous and true, how long—O HOW LONG! So, they, the profligate actors in this case, "crucified the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame!"

If, as men talk—the Federal Government is bound to protect slavery, must not the power to control it be involved in the obligation?

Whatever we are bound to protect, we have a right to control.

\* See Principia of March 9, Article—"The Great Change." Ed.

FROM REV. D. WORTH.

ECONOMY, WAYNE CO. IND., March 9, 1861.

REV. W. GOODSELL:—I see from the public prints that a woman running to preserve her woman's heart and woman's virtue has been caught in Cleveland and thrown back into the boiling seething hell of slavery. A meeting of rejoicing, composed largely of Republicans, was held on the occasion. The Virginia kidnapper was called upon for a speech, to which call he promptly responded, and was most

"vociferously applauded." Republicans, such as Spaulding and Slade, (the latter the son of the late Abolitionist Governor of Vermont), having first assisted the kidnapper to secure his prey, ventilated their Republican patriotism in joy at the prompt execution of the Fugitive law. The girl appears to have stood by in handcuffs while the kidnappers of Virginia and Cleveland rejoiced together. Doubtless there was as jubilee in hell! Venerable and honored among the great lights of liberty have been the names of Adams and Slade. How disgraced in their degenerate offspring! Mr. Slade "will support the Fugitive Act, so long as it remains to be law." Certainly. So, had he lived in the days of Nebuchadnezzar he would have worshipped the image, or murdered the infants at the mandate of Herod. Poor, miserable, drivelling Atheism, which worships the "throne of iniquity which frameth mischief by a law." And what shall be the end of a party whose anti-slavery consists in stealing women, and whose morality measures shoulder to shoulder with the Fugitive Act? It will die the death of a felon, and like Israel's King, "be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem." D. WORTH.

THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS VINDICATES ITSELF.

On Friday evening, 22d inst. a special meeting of the Church of the Puritans, called at the instance of ten members opposed to the continuance of Dr. Cheever's ministry among them, was held in the lecture room. The Rev. S. R. DAVIS was called to the chair.

Mr. E. W. Chester states that he, and his friends co-operating with him, had requested that meeting to be called for the purpose of applying to the Church for a Mutual Council to settle the difficulties existing among them. The application which he read, set forth as difficulties, the various decisions of the church at its regular and special meetings during the last two years, and finishes up by a special recommendation to the Church, in the case of their granting a Mutual Council, to submit to that body, when it should meet, the question whether the good of the Church of the Puritans and the welfare of the cause of Christ in the city of New York generally, did not demand that the relations between Rev. George B. Cheever D. D., and the Church of the Puritans be dissolved! The application was signed by 72 persons calling themselves members of the Church. A large number of them, however, had not attended the Church of the Puritans for many years, whilst many more had taken their letters to other churches.

On motion of Mr. McNab the application was rejected by an overwhelming majority.

The report of the Peace Committee, recently appointed by the Church to endeavor to secure a reconciliation among the brethren, was next called for. It was read by Mr. Gilbert, clerk of the Church. This document set forth that in regard to certain individuals, the labors of the Committee had been successful; but there was a factious few who, instead of exhibiting any desire for a reconciliation, had started an application for a Mutual Council, the aim of which was to sever the connection between the Pastor and the Church. For this reason the committee had been compelled to wind up its business, and report to the Church, asking to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject submitted to it.

Dr. Hartt offered the following resolution: Resolved, That the report of the Committee just read, be accepted, adopted and ordered; and that for the reasons therein stated E. W. Chester, Chas. Abernethy, C. R. Harvey, Geo. H. White, Thomas Rigney, and Rev. Joel Blackmer, be and are hereby suspended from all the rights and privileges of membership in this Church until the Church take other action in the premises. The Resolution being seconded, was discussed at length by E. W. Chester, Dr. Alonzo S. Ball, C. R. Harvey, Chas. Abernethy, Dr. Hartt, Edward Gilbert and others. At 11½ o'clock a motion was made for the previous question, which a majority decided should be taken.

Dr. Hartt's motion was then stated by the Chairman, and carried by vote of 73 in favor, and 13 against.

The meeting then adjourned.

W. H.

The above, furnished us by a member of the Church of the Puritans, will be read with interest by the many thousands and tens of thousands of its friends in both hemispheres. We had heard, some time since, that the disaffected members were trying to get a Mutual Council. We are gratified to know that the Church understood the wiles of the adversary, better than to be caught in that trap. "A Mutual Council," forsooth, to be composed, of course, to a large extent, of ministers and delegates of churches who hold in utter contempt and bitter hatred the principles and objects cherished, by the Church of the Puritans, as identical with the fundamental truths of Christianity and the sacred cause of the Redeemer. As well might Nehemiah have consented to hold a mutual council with Tobiah, and Sanballat, and Geshem the Arabian, on the plains of Ono. These claimed to be worshippers of the God of Nehemiah, and kindly proffered their aid in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, as the most feasible method of preventing the work from going forward, and were willing no doubt, to

have a fingering of the funds that had come from the foreign aid mission of Nehemiah at a distance, provided they could contrive to divert them from the design of the donors. And we have no doubt that their successors would be very glad to get hold of Dr. Cheever's "foreign funds" for equally pious ends.

#### RESULT OF THE VICTORY.

Article XIII. No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or servitude by the laws of said State.

Here is the proposition for an irrevocable law, passed by both Houses of Congress, and presented to the country on the day of the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln, the first President pledged to resist the extension of slavery! The proposition originated with Republicans, was advocated mainly by Republicans, and is now sent to the several States for ratification with the indorsement of a Republican President! What would have been the fate of such a proposition, if it had been thrown before the country on the inaugural day of President Pierce in 1853, or of President Buchanan in 1857? Would there have been, at either of those periods, any doubt of its emphatic rejection, not merely by one-fourth, but by a majority of the States? If there had been the least possible chance of its becoming a law, how would the country have rung with denunciations of the infamous proposal?

Or suppose that John C. Breckenridge, instead of Abraham Lincoln, had been successful in this contest, how would such a proposal to change the Constitution have been regarded then? Would the Republican papers of this city have kept silence? Would the *Tribune* have been dumb? Every pen would have been in motion. The booming cannon would have resounded from the Aroostook to Puget's Sound. The whole area of Freedom would have been aroused with indignation at the perfidious Democracy, that dared to lay its sacrilegious hand on the Constitution, and mar its beautiful proportions by a formal insertion of what Madison declared inadmissible, "the idea of property in man!" Meetings would have been called; the eloquence of the nation would have been put in requisition, petitions circulated, members of the several State Legislatures would have been appealed to by their constituents for an avowal of their sentiments, and the grand question in elections would have been, "Are you in favor of nationalizing and immortalizing the institution of slavery?"—American Baptist.

We gladly welcome the aid of the "American Baptist" in sounding the alarm, before the fetters of the nation are rivetted. The necessity of prompt and earnest remonstrance may be seen from the following:

From the N. Y. Sun.

#### AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Gov. MORGAN yesterday transmitted to the Legislature the joint resolution adopted by Congress at its late session, proposing to the several State Legislatures an article amendatory to the Constitution, providing that no amendment shall be made thereafter which shall give to Congress power to abolish or interfere with the institution of slavery in any state within which it may exist. In transmitting the joint resolution, Governor MORGAN makes an earnest appeal to the Legislature to adopt it.

The proposed amendment, he says, commends itself to the judgment, while it conforms to the sentiment of the people of this state, who have always adhered to the doctrine of the right of the states respectively to control their domestic institutions in such manner as they may judge most conducive to their prosperity and happiness. He further thinks that the border states would accept such amendment to the Constitution as the resolution proposes, as an earnest of the honest desire of the northern states to preserve for them, for all time, their Constitutional rights.

We sincerely hope that the conciliatory and conservative spirit of the Governor's communication will be heartily responded to, by our State Legislature. The great object of the joint resolution and of the Constitutional amendment which it proposes, is to calm apprehension in the border slave states, and to convince them that though the people of the Northern States are opposed to the institution of slavery and would not re-establish it among themselves, they entertain no design, and would not use any power they might possess to interfere with the institution in the states where it exists, for its injury or abolition.

But the adoption of the amendment by the Legislatures of the Northern states, would not only, in all probability, keep the border states firmly attached to the Union, but it would be a public and practical refutation of the misrepresentation so artfully and wickedly used by the secession conspirators, that the northern people are all abolitionists and are only awaiting the opportunity and the possession of the power, to invade the rights of the southern states, destroy their domestic institutions and involve them in irreparable ruin. It would revive the spirit and strengthen the cause of the union men in the seceded states, who have for the time been borne down and paralyzed by the sudden violence and daring treason of the disunionists. And might we not hope that it would also be the means of reuniting the broken links in the chain of interest, friendship and national pride which has so long bound us together as one people, having a common name and a common destiny?



# The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1861.

LETTERS on business for the *Principia* should be addressed to M. B. WILLIAMS, the Publisher.

LETTERS for the Editor, whether for his consideration, or for the public, should be addressed to WILLIAM GOODELL.

ORDERS for books or pamphlets may be addressed to either of the above.

But in all cases, the business matter should be on a slip of paper separate from suggestions or communications for the Editor—because business papers must be kept on the Publisher's file, by themselves. For the same reason, what is designed for the Publisher should be on one slip of paper, and matter designed for the Editor's attention or use should be on another, though all may be put into one envelope, and directed to either.

## THE DEPTHS OF DEGRADATION—NORTHERN SERVILITY—THE ARTS OF POLITICIANS.

We displace several interesting articles this week, to make room for a thrilling story of outrage, which we copy from the *N. Y. Tribune*.

We have republished the narrative, not because it discloses anything novel, or relates anything unusual, for the picture it presents may be regarded a fair representation of what has, long since, become the normal condition of things in this country. But, as it happened to be "the latest" specimen of the kind, and coming, as it did, in the midst of another class of thrilling developments, we thought it a good time to bring them together and see how they would match. The train of thought suggested to us, by this narrative, differs, somewhat, from that expressed by the *Tribune's* caption to the narrative, namely, "the reign of Ruffianism, the Southern Chivalry—A woman's story." It brought to our mind the converse of these, namely, *The Depths of Degradation—Northern Servility—The arts of Politicians*. And so we have headed our article accordingly.

The *Tribune* itself, has an editorial concerning it, headed "THE NEW INQUISITION," a part of which well introduces our subject,

"The present generation, absorbed by the great events which have shaken the civilized world since the outbreak of the French Revolution, and by the scarcely less important history which is going on under its own eyes, has nearly forgotten the events and the institutions which occupied the thoughts and excited the feelings of its predecessors. In the days that are past and gone, the whole Protestant world, and the better part of the Catholic world, grew pale with horror and indignation at the name of the inquisition. Its sudden and secret arrests, its brutal officers, its impassive judges, its gloomy dungeons, and the tortures it inflicted on men and women guilty of no crime, save unpopular opinions, were infamous in all lands, and were especially odious and abhorred in free and Protestant England and America.

"A century ago the autos de fe were discontinued, and the last heretic suffered death by fire, and even in bigoted Spain the Inquisition withered before the light of civilization until it was swept away by the French invaders in 1808, and after a temporary revival under the despot Ferdinand VII., was finally abolished in 1835. For a century, no human being has been burnt at the stake in any part of the known world until, under the influence of a pro-slavery fanaticism fiercer and more malignant than the fanaticism of Spain in its worst days, the crowning atrocity of the Inquisition was revived in the Slave States of this country. With the burnings to death have been revived, also, the whippings, the brandings, the midnight arrests, and the cruel imprisonments of the Inquisition. The punishment of death by fire, we believe, is reserved exclusively for negroes. We have heard of no case where it has yet been inflicted on white men or women. The prescribed modes of punishment for them, when convicted or suspected of erroneous opinions, are personal tortures not affecting life, and imprisonment, and exile. But even these milder forms of correction are dealt out by the new Inquisition to its victims with a grim severity that would have extorted a smile of approbation from the sternest Inquisitor-General of old Spain.

"The latest case that has fully come to light of the doings of this tribunal will be found in *The Tribune* to-day. It is the statement of Mrs. Catherine Bottsford, a widow lady of this city, now residing at No. 157 Hudson street."

After recapitulating some of the salient points of the "Woman's story"—the *Tribune* concludes thus:

"The most surprising thing that happened to her during her imprisonment was the receipt of a letter from the Mayor of New-York, to whom she had contrived to send an appeal for help. Fernando Wood replied in a style that filled her, she says, with astonishment and indignation. The letter will be found at full length in her narrative, and is well worthy of attentive perusal."

We confess it strikes us that many things, still more surprising than the letter from Mayor Wood, (from whom any thing better was not to have been expected,) transpired about that time, before, during, and after that imprisonment, and are still transpiring, before our eyes, daily.

What was going on, all the while that Mrs. Bottsford was subjected to these indignities, and while scores and hundreds, of a similar character, were previously and constantly coming to light?

A great political party, at the North, perfectly aware of these ruffianly outrages, and claiming the support of the people on the ground of their promises to terminate them by "getting the Government of the country out of the hands of the Slave Power" was canvassing for the votes of all who were credulous enough to rely on its professions, coupled, most ludicrously, as those promises and professions were, with pledges to "let slavery alone in the States where it already exists" and, still more specifically, to help catch fugitive slaves!

Another strange thing that happened, but a short time since, closely connected with this outrage and similar ones was the Inauguration of a new President, elected by this successful party, on which occasion he not only renewed his pledge of fealty to the slave power, but expressed his willingness to have the Constitution so amended, as to make the pledge a national one, interwoven into its Constitution, and made "irrevocable" in all coming ages!

And "the most surprising thing" of all was, perhaps, the tacit consent of *The Tribune*, to all this, standing, as that Journal does, at the very centre of information, and at the head of influence in all that relates to such matters?

The Spanish Inquisition, the *Tribune* remarks, has been abolished. And the new Inquisition, it avers, (justly, and truthfully,) is "fiercer and more malignant than the fanaticism of Spain in its worst days." When will the influence of the *Tribune* be cast into the scale of the abolition of this fiercer and more malignant inquisition? When will it cease to endorse, as the climax of political wisdom, the policy of pledging the nation, its rulers, and its politicians, to the solemn duty of letting this "inquisition" alone, in the States where it already exists—the very states in which these ruffianly outrages are committed? Was it by such a policy that the Inquisition of Spain was abolished? Has the *Tribune* no word of reproof for President Lincoln, nor for Gov. Morgan of New York, (both of whom owe their elevation, in no small measure to the powerful advocacy of the *Tribune*), when they both recommend a change of the Federal Constitution for the very purpose of rendering the Federal tolerance and protection of the Southern Inquisition "irrevocable"?

Who does not know that while slavery itself is tolerated "the Reign of Ruffianism" by which it is kept in being, and in which it consists, is tolerated likewise? What can the *Tribune* mean by crying out against the ruffianism, while approvingly supporting the pledged guardians of its perpetuity?

Talk of "State Rights!" Talk of the lack of Federal power! What right has the State of South Carolina, whether seceded or in the Union, to treat the citizens of the United States and of the State of New York, as Mrs. Bottsford was treated?

The same right, it may be said, that it has, to treat hundreds of thousands of colored women in a worse manner. Granted. But what right has it to do either?

Suppose the State of Maine, or the Republic of Mexico should undertake to claim and exercise the same right. Would it be tolerated, for a moment? No. But why not? Simply because the people of Maine and of Mexico are not slaveholders, and do not crack the Slave driver's lash over this state, and this Nation. And neither our Presidents, our Governors, nor our Editors stand in awe of non-slaveholders. That is the sole reason.

Let France, or England, or Russia, (to say nothing of the weaker nations, Spain and Mexico) lay a finger upon a New York lady, as the South Carolinians did upon Mrs. Bottsford, and President Lincoln, with Gov. Morgan's official cooperation, and the *Tribune's* rousing appeals of approval, would demand instant reparation, and, for any tardiness of compliance, would put in requisition, the army, the navy, and the treasury of the United States, to avenge the insult. Before the majesty of the slaveholding Mayor of Charleston, all remonstrance is hushed. There is no

constitutional authority. There is no pecuniary appropriation. There is no physical nor moral ability. The highest authority, the most august, dignity, in America, is that of the slaveholder. And thus it must be, until the grand imperial order of American Slaveholders is abolished. No other remedy is possible.

It was Mayor Wood's "absurd letter" that most roused the indignation of Mrs. Bottsford, and no wonder. It was the same letter that was most surprising to the *Tribune*.

"No other power can aid you in the distress you have brought upon yourself, and you must rely solely on the mercy of those who administer the laws you have broken, and the generosity of the people you have injured."

FERNANDO WOOD, Mayor.

Mr. Mayor Wood, expresses, in this, but the current political creed of the country, did he not? The Breckenridge creed—the Douglas creed—the Bell-Everitt creed—the Republican creed—the Lincoln and Tribune creed. Say, gentlemen, statesmen, editors, and politicians, Is there any other power? Can the Federal Government protect Mrs. Bottsford? Can the New York State Government? Let Mr. Lincoln—let Mr. Morgan—let the *Tribune* answer. According to their own party creed, according to their own exposition of the Constitution, can it be done? Or otherwise than by the expositions of the Radical political Abolitionists? If so, how? If so, WHY IS IT NOT DONE?

No. Mrs. Bottsford. When you fall into the hands of an American slaveholder, no earthly power but that of the slaveholder himself can relieve you. And for this plain reason, there is no power in the nation paramount or equal to that of the slaveholder, acting as such. All other dignitaries are subject to the control of law. The slaveholder, in all that relates to slaves and slavery, is the exception. Take away from him this superiority to law and this independence of Civil Government, and he ceases to be a slaveholder, in the fact that the slave, being protected by law, and by the government, is a slave no longer.

"Absurd" as Mayor Wood's letter may be, there is one thing that is more absurd. And that is, the idea that a slaveholder, acting as such and remaining such, can be subjected to law, in the presence of which, slaveholding ceases—the idea that there can be protection from slaveholders in a nation that permits slaveholders.

The tolerance of a polecat, in your cellar, or garret, or kitchen, or bed room, or parlor, is, of necessity the tolerance there, of all that goes into the composition and definition of the animal. So of the porcupine, or the serpent. The tolerance of either is the toleration of what necessarily belongs to him, whether it be stench, piercing quills, venomous bite, sting, or what not. If you let them alone where they exist, you must put up with the annoyance and inconvenience, as best you may. There is no use in surprise, indignation, or astonishment. The only call for these, is the fact that a free, civilized, and "Christian" people, should allow such a nuisance among them, or in their neighborhood!

As for "recognizing the secession" as the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* advises, how much would it help the Mrs. Bottsford, or the slaves, unless there were recognized, also at the same time, the right and duty of the inhabitants of this continent, to put an end to the nuisance. So long as the people of America allow slaveholders in America, so long the people of America will remain servile, and must make up their minds to be treated as they are, and have been, and will be, so long as slavery is tolerated—that is, treated as inferiors—serfs—slaves!

We have no words to express a tythe of our "astonishment and indignation" at the idea of freemen casting their votes for the creatures who, in an hour like this, can talk of amending the Constitution, so as to invest the royal order of American Slaveholders, with an "irrevocable" franchise, for the sake—(Oh, horrors!) of an interminable Union with them.

But only think of "the Rev. Dr. Howe of St. Phillip's Church."—A consolatory and apostolic pastor—is he not? Who would not sit with delight under his pulpit?

"Oh, that's treason, most decidedly," waving his hand, as though it were a foregone conclusion.

The *Tribune*, no doubt, is astonished, indignant at this also? But why should it be.—Why should the *Observer*, or even the *Independent* be, if they are? What is sedition?—Noah Webster tells us that "sedition" is "the dis-

position to

law, or the

Was Mr

Southside

And how

Whether

much, on t

pro-slavery

ues, as we

lican party

has the sa

ready exist

interfere, v

tection of i

as well as

subjects, li

States are

ers of the

in every ot

deny that t

law" were

if the Rep

free States

it their fun

a private c

New York

without inc

tation, the

code as va

well as Sta

nition to l

And if th

sinfulness

effectual c

Mrs. Botts

sinful to h

and consequ

practice, m

ernment ca

that if Mrs.

that innoc

to protect i

Howe was

as a ministe

might repe

and a Chris

the law.—

called for

iligious tea

slaveholdin

servility an

lation as to

civil govern

One aspe

have done.

and craven

culine gend

times called

ford, and n

try, aye, of

petrated up

noble spirit

ly, all the p

and the spo

who boast

of their own

especially,

Let ever

ford ask he

ing citizen

Ruffianly "I

and wheth

confide in t

A

ACT

The follo

the Mission

(Rev. Dr. C

15, 1860:

Whereas,

principal obj

States in the



position to excite popular commotion, in opposition to law, or the act of exciting such commotion."

Was Mrs. Bottsford seditious? So the *Observer* and Dr. Southside Adams, would doubtless, say.

And how could the *Tribune* or the *Independent* demur?—Whether she was seditious or not, must depend, very much, on the question whether slavery be lawful—whether pro-slavery statutes be law? If the *Tribune* still continues, as we suppose it does, to hold the creed of the Republican party, that slavery is the creature of municipal law, and has the sacredness of valid law, in the States where it already exists, inasmuch that the Federal Government cannot interfere, within the limits of the slave States, for the protection of its colored subjects, and, (by parity of reasoning, as well as of usage), cannot interfere to protect its white subjects, like Mrs. Bottsford—if the slave codes of the States are thus valid, holding in check the protecting powers of the Federal Government that can protect its subjects in every other part of the Globe, then how can the *Tribune* deny that the words of Mrs. Bottsford "in opposition to the law" were "seditious?" If the Federal Government, if the Republican party, its President and Governors of free States, acknowledge the validity of slave law, and limit their functions by its demands and its presence, how can a private citizen of the United States, and of the State of New York, utter a word "in opposition to such a law" (!) without incurring the guilt of "sedition?" If the "Constitution, the supreme law of the land" recognizes the Slave code as valid, how without "sedition" against Federal as well as State authority shall any one utter aught "in opposition to law"—the law of slavery?

And if the *Independent* continues to deny the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, how can it consistently deny, or effectually confute the statement of the Rev. Dr. Howe, that Mrs. Bottsford was guilty of sedition? If it be not inherently sinful to hold slaves, then it must be inherently innocent, and consequently the practice, like every other innocent practice, must be entitled to legal protection, and the Government cannot innocently withhold that protection. So that if Mrs. Bottsford assailed, with her eloquent tongue, that innocent practice, and the laws (if they be laws) necessary to protect it, then was she guilty, indeed, of sedition, and Dr. Howe was altogether in the right. It was, then, his duty, as a minister of the Gospel, to point out to her the sin, that she might repent of it, and be saved, while he, as a good citizen and a Christian teacher, was bound to rebuke violations of the law.—If indignation and astonishment, therefore, are called for, in the case, it should be directed against that religious teaching that denies the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, a heresy that lies at the root of the political servility and degradation that defers to pro-slavery legislation as to valid law, and limits the protecting powers of civil government, accordingly.

One aspect of the case, more, and, for the present, we have done. Can imagination conceive of a more servile and craven creature, than a being of the genus homo, masculine gender, a biped, in pants, calling himself, and sometimes called, a man, who can read the letter of Mrs. Bottsford, and not blush to reflect that he is a citizen of a country, aye, of a Republic, wherein such outrages can be perpetrated upon woman, upon a lady of the intelligence and noble spirit of Mrs. Bottsford, without its eliciting, instantly, all the protecting powers of a free national Government, and the spontaneous defence of the millions of free citizens who boastfully call that national government an institution of their own, for their own protection and for the security, especially, of woman?

Let every woman, who reads the letter of Mrs. Bottsford ask herself what she thinks of the manhood of the voting citizen who can vote for a President pledged to let that Ruffianly "Inquisition" alone, in the States where it exists, and whether she should for herself, or for her daughter, confide in the protection of such a man, as a husband.

#### AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.

##### ACTION OF THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.

The following preamble and resolutions were adopted by the Missionary Association of the Church of the Puritans (Rev. Dr. Cheever's) in this city, at a meeting held April 15, 1860:

Whereas, The American Sunday-school Union, one of whose principal objects is to instruct the children and youth of the United States in the truths and principles of the Christian religion by the

issue and circulation among them of "moral and religious publications," has suppressed and stricken from its list of publications a work well adapted to that end, truthfully describing and representing human slavery as unjust and sinful, solely because the language therein used in reference to that subject has been declared offensive by some persons engaged in or intimately connected with the practice of that sin;—therefore,

Resolved, That this Association do, and it hereby does earnestly and solemnly protest against such suppression, as constituting, in the opinion of this Association, a refusal on the part of the American Sunday-school Union to utter a word of sympathy and kindness in behalf of an oppressed and down-trodden race within the legitimate sphere of its operations and influence, and as evincing a willingness and purpose to apologize for and tacitly sanction the most atrocious system of cruelty and oppression—of deliberate and organized violation of some of the plainest precepts of the Christian religion—now prevailing in his land.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Association, the principles of honesty, of justice, of duty, of Christianity, alike imperatively require that the American Sunday-school Union, at once restore to its list of publications the work so improperly suppressed, or take other proper measures to remove the stigma now resting upon it as an apparent apologist for the gigantic sin of American slavery.

Resolved, That should the American Sunday-school Union persist in its present policy of suppression and concealment upon the subject in these resolutions mentioned, and should it refuse to take any reformatory action in reference thereto within a reasonable time hereafter, this Association will consider itself in duty bound to dissolve its connection with that organization, and withhold all its contributions therefrom, so long as such policy of suppression and concealment be maintained.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the American Sunday-school Union, and that Society respectfully requested to communicate to this Association, without delay, the action by it taken thereupon.

These resolutions were immediately forwarded to the Sunday-school Union at Philadelphia, and received by that Society. No response having been made to them, the Association, at its annual meeting, held on the 30th December last, adopted the following additional preamble and resolutions, and both sets of resolutions were ordered to be published:

Whereas, The resolutions concerning the position of the American Sunday-school Union in reference to the sin of slavery which were adopted by this Association and transmitted to that Society in the month of April last, although more than eight months have since elapsed, have received no response, and the attitude of that Society toward that sin remains unaltered and unexplained;—therefore,

Resolved, That this Association must, and it does, interpret such inaction and neglect of explanation as indicating a disposition and purpose on the part of the American Sunday-school Union to adhere to its present long-continued policy, and to wholly ignore in its publications the inherent sinfulness of American slaveholding.

Resolved, That this Association, in justice to itself—in justice to millions in this land now groaning in cruel bondage—in justice to the principles of the Christian religion, cannot consent to remain in co-operation with a Society sanctioning, even in appearance, so great a sin; that all connection of this Association with the American Sunday-School Union be, and the same hereby is dissolved; and that no part of the moneys now collected, and no part of the moneys which shall in future be received by this Association for missionary purposes, be contributed to that Society.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the American Sunday-school Union.  
J. EVARTS TRACY, Pres.  
New York, January 16, 1861. E. M. MERRILL, Sec'y.

## News of the Day.

From the N. Y. Tribune.

### THE REIGN OF RUFFIANISM.

SOUTHERN CHIVALRY.

#### A WOMAN'S STORY.

Without claiming any distinction as a martyr, I wish to make a plain statement of the facts respecting my arrest and confinement in the jail at Charleston, S. C., during the months of October and November last, which I feel is due to many friends who have kindly interested themselves in my behalf, and who are desirous of more satisfactory information concerning my case.

I left New-York for Charleston on the first day of December, 1859; when I arrived in the latter city, I was not aware of any ill-feeling or prejudice against the Northern people, but I soon learned of cruel outrages and violent threats against strangers from the North, and these called forth the indignation I could not always conceal, as I was quite unprepared for such developments, in a civilized community. For this reason I confined myself quietly and closely to my business, seeking no acquaintances.

I had gone thither with the most peaceable and friendly intentions, harboring no purpose of meddling with local institutions, though my sentiments were by no means favorable to slavery. I was very careful to hold no conversation with any of the colored people; they knew nothing of me, and I was an utter stranger to them all, and should have remained so, had not the persecution I suffered given me notoriety. I never forced my opinions on any one, but when asked what I thought of Slavery I always told them the truth, in a friendly spirit, disclaiming all intention of interfering with them. I had too much respect for them to suppose they could respect a pandering hypocrite, and I, therefore, told them my sentiments, which were the result of early education. I admitted that their education and habits made it natural for us to differ on the question of Slavery; and, on their side, they appeared to have no suspicion of me. The summer passed thus quietly away, and I had no more fear there than if I had been living in my Northern home.

It was on the 27th of September that, as I was alone in my room, having hardly recovered from a severe illness, a

large and coarse man presented himself before me, without permission or announcement. He demanded my name; I told him, and asked what he wished. He stated that he was one of the Vigilant Police, and ordered me to go with him to the Mayor's Court, that officer having sent for me. I said I would not go, and asked him what right he had to insult and molest me; whether he had any written authority to demand my presence. He said No. Then followed this conversation—I beginning it by asking:

"What does the Mayor want of me?"

"I understand you are an Abolitionist."

"Yes; and what of that?"

"You must come with me or I will take you by force," said he, angrily.

I considered for a moment, and decided on the whole it was best to go with him quietly. I thought it probable the Mayor had been imposed upon by some idle reports, and that after hearing what I had to say, he would dismiss me with an apology for being the occasion of this unwonted intrusion. I immediately made myself ready, and went with the man to the Guard House. I was ushered into the common court room, where several idlers were assembled, who seemed to have no other business than to await my coming, but the Mayor was not there. I waited an hour, expecting every moment he would make his appearance, those around me in the mean time whispering among themselves, though they said nothing to me. I took no notice of them, but began to get very impatient for my expected interview. A ruffianly-looking man soon came in carrying a large bunch of keys. "Step this way, Madam," said he. I followed him without the least apprehension, supposing the Mayor would be respectful enough to hear me in his own room rather than before a crowd, for I had done nothing, and had nothing to fear. I was led through two or three large rooms, and through an infirmary, where there were several sick people in bed.

"Where are you going?" said I to the man. "This way, ma'ma," said he, opening a door that led by a flight of steps to a long, dark passage; on each side were the underground cells. I looked around me. Two or three rough looking fellows stood by me ready to do the jailer's bidding, while he opened one of these dirty dismal cells.

"Come down," said he, "and go in there." I asked, in surprise, "what does this mean?" "It means that you are to be put in here; it is the Mayor's orders."

I was thrust in and locked up. Shortly after, the same man opened the door and wished me to give my name in full. I told him I should not answer his questions; I wished to see the Mayor immediately. He said I must wait until I was called for, and then locked the door. I saw no one again that day. Night came—9 o'clock. I grew sick and faint from breathing the foul air; I had scarcely recovered from recent sickness. The poor wretches dragged in from the streets, screaming and groaning, were thrown in cells around me, from which I was separated only by a thin board partition. No place could be more painfully disagreeable to pass a night in than that.

I knocked on the door to attract the attention of the turnkey as he was passing; he opened the door and asked what I wanted; I told him I wanted to get out of that place, and asked him if he would put me in a decent room. No, the Mayor had left strict orders that I should be kept there until he chose to see me, when I asked the man to take a note or message to some of my friends or acquaintances as I needed some relief; he said: "This place is as good as the other cells, and you have got to stay here. You have reason to fear lest something worse than death may happen to you. Your sentiments don't suit the people here." I told him to go away and lock the door, as I would not hear another word from him. He left then without any more words, and I saw no one again that night.

In the morning, a pail of water was put in the cell, but nothing else. At 2 o'clock the door was unlocked by an officer, who told me the Mayor was ready to see me. There were many people stationed along the passages, but they did not say a word as I walked through to the Mayor's room, which was filled with respectable looking men.

The Mayor read the charges he had written down. No witness was called; no one appeared against me. The examination was as follows:

"Mrs. Bottsford, you are accused of treason and sedition?"

"I am not guilty of treason or sedition."

"I understand you have been tampering with slaves?"

"It is utterly false, Sir, I have had nothing to say to the slaves."

"You are an Abolitionist?"

"Yes."

"An admirer of John Brown?"

"Yes."

"You have expressed Abolition sentiments?"

"I have on a few occasions when asked; I can name all I ever conversed with, and what I said to them I will say here. I lived here nearly a year, attending closely to my own business; I have not injured or offended any one, and have been well treated until now; I cannot see why I should be subjected to this outrage."

"You say you have been well treated?"

"Yes, until now."

"Then I think you have been very ungrateful: you have been well treated, been profitably employed, and have received our money while you hated us?"



"I have not hated the people; I am no friend to slavery; I have not seen anything in Charleston to give me a more favorable impression of it; quite otherwise. I have paid for all I have had here. I have received what I have earned. I owe you no gratitude."

"I would advise you to go home."

"I shall certainly do so as soon as I can settle my business. I have no desire to stay a moment longer."

The Mayor then said he had not heard anything against my character. "You are spoken of," said he, "as quiet and respectable. But I require bail for your good conduct. If you can find any one to be your bail for three hundred dollars, I can dismiss you."

I told him I had not been guilty of any bad conduct, and could not get any bail. He then left the room with one or two more. As I afterward learned, he was persuaded I was an emissary for some Northern society or publisher. I saw no more of him. He sent the turnkey in; I was ordered to the cell again, and locked up. Some of my friends from the house I left felt alarmed, and had been several times to inquire for me, but could get no satisfactory answer, and were rudely driven away.

In an hour or so an officer opened the door, and said I must go with him, as the Mayor had given me over to the State's Attorney. We crossed the Citadel Park to the office of Magistrate Kanapaux. Twenty or thirty citizens were gathered there, and among them one whom I was acquainted with, and had conversed with, about two weeks before. I spoke to him, and asked him if he was the complainant. He said he was. I indignantly asked him if he was not ashamed of himself; if it was possible he could do anything so contemptible. Without waiting for his reply, the Magistrate answered for him: "This man has done perfectly right; I should have done just so myself; why, if you had been a man you would have been hung up on one of the trees in the Park; you would never have got here alive." I asked very calmly, if any one wanted my life. No, the Magistrate said; as I was a woman my life might be spared. But the Mayor had been too lenient; he had raised my bail to \$2,000, in default of which I must go to jail. I told him it made no difference about the amount of the bail; I was no criminal, and I needed no bail.

"Are you not an Abolitionist?"

"Yes, I am."

"You are charged with treason and sedition, and tampering with slaves."

"All these charges are utterly false; I have said nothing to the slaves; they do not know me."

"Do you hold correspondence North, and receive papers and letters?"

"Only from my nearest friends a few letters, no papers."

"Do you not read *The Tribune*?"

"No; because I cannot get it here; I should read it, if I could get it."

"You need not answer all my questions; you may commit yourself."

"No fear of that, Sir; I am perfectly willing to answer your questions; there is nothing to conceal."

He then asked many more—*as, when I had lived in New York; where I had lived, and what I had been doing?* I answered all readily. Then I asked, civilly, if he would allow me to ask him some questions. Who had said I had tampered with slaves? I had never held any conversation in their hearing. No; he could not listen to me then, nor before these, pointing to those around him.

"If you can think of any one that will be your bail, I will send for him, or else you must go to jail, said he."

"I told him I should not ask any bail."

"Well, go to jail; you cannot speak here; my officer is waiting to take you to jail."

I walked through the streets by the side of the constable to the jail, which was at some distance; during this time two men were sent to search my room; they broke open my trunks and bundles, unrolled every parcel, trying to find papers or letters; but they found nothing they wanted, though they carried off one or two of my letters. When I got to the jail I was faint and exhausted; it was now 6 o'clock on the second day; I had not had a morsel of food for nearly forty-eight hours. I sent to my friends at the house which I had left, and just before the jail was to be shut for the night, the lady of the house appeared at the door. She had not been allowed to see me before, though she had tried repeatedly. If she had not come just then, I should not have had anything until the next day, when the prison rations would be served. The jailers had strict orders to show me no favors; I was to be lodged with the common prisoners of the female ward; no one outside the walls was allowed to give me aid or comfort; I was to remain here four months, and then take my trial for treason and sedition. The jailer told me I must take leave of my friend, and go to my quarters with the rest, as he was to lock the jail for the night. The lady asked him if I should be comfortable? He said yes; I should fare like the rest; he could make no distinction, without orders. So then I was to be a prisoner again, and not alone, but with such poor creatures as are the usual inmates of such places; two drunken, abandoned women, were to occupy the room with me.

This is a jail, Madam, said the jailer, as he opened the door of the miserable cell; you cannot expect much here. I thought he was indeed right; there was not the least comfort of any kind; not an article of furniture; nothing but

a dirty blanket on the floor to sleep on. Locked in here with such company, with the roar of the blood hounds that were loosed for the night to guard the yard, with the yellings and clanking of chains of the male prisoners, I passed another terrible night. I am certain I could not have endured all the privations of this place had the orders of the magistrates been strictly carried out.

The Sheriff visited the jail, after two or three days. He was quite a different man, and seemed anxious to do all he could for me; I afterward had a room to myself, and my friends were permitted to send me such articles of furniture as I needed, from the place where I had lived. He also allowed the Sisters of Charity to visit me, who, with one other lady, daily supplied my wants, and made me as comfortable as I could be in that situation. To these good women I feel that I owe my life. They used their influence to effect my release, procured me counsel, and did all they could to serve me; they also sent one of their friends, with a petition for my release, to the State Attorney, Judge Wayne, but he would not listen to it. A German gentleman offered to procure bail, and spoke more warmly in my behalf than it suited these honorable gentlemen to hear. No amount of bail need now be offered, they said; I should stay in jail and stand my trial. Before night four warrants were out for his arrest; he had to leave even his clothing, and steal out of the city, or he too would have gone to jail.

As for myself, I sent no petition, wanted no favors. But justice and my liberty I demanded. The Rev. Dr. Howe of St. Philip's Church visited me with Judge Pringle, on hearing I was a member of his church. They said they were sorry to see me a prisoner, asking, "why are you here, and what have you done?" I told them my story, and that I was there on a charge of treason and sedition, which was most ridiculous, as well as false; the treason was on their own part, not on mine.

"You have said you were an Abolitionist," said the minister.

"Yes."

"Oh, that's treason, that's sedition, most decidedly," waving his hand, as though it were a foregone conclusion.

"Oh, no," I answered; "it is quite useless to try to persuade me that I have been guilty of anything like that; I know what treason and sedition are, as well as you. I know what the Constitutional laws of our country are; I claim their protection. You are not out of the Union yet."

"Well, we have slaves, and we mean to keep them; I own them myself. We are irrepressible despots, you must know; we have laws here that strictly forbid any such expressions as you have made."

"Such laws are nothing to me; let those obey them that choose to. I am no slave, if you claim to be despots. I have my rights, and mean to have them respected."

The minister advised me to send a petition to the Mayor and State's Attorney. If I would go home immediately, he would see what he could do for me. I positively refused to send any petition, as I had suffered, and had been most shamefully wronged. I would not consent to be smuggled off in disgrace. I would be very glad to go as soon as I could leave honorably. I turned to Judge Pringle and asked him if he would grant me a writ of habeas corpus. He would hear what the other party had to say.

The minister showed me some trifling favors in the way of affording me some bodily comforts, which I declined. They both seemed much perplexed, and to do these gentlemen justice, I believe they were heartily ashamed of the whole transaction. Mr. Northrop offered his services as my counsel. He seemed convinced that what I said was entirely true; but they were talking of revolution, and legal proceedings would be of little account, so I was convinced that I need not expect anything but to remain a long time in jail, I did not know how long.

I then wrote to Mayor Wood, of New York, knowing he had much influence with the Charleston people; I related the facts substantially as I have done here, praying him to make my case known to the Governor. I received his answer directed to the care of Mayor Macbeth; the following is an exact copy:

"MAYOR'S OFFICE, New York, Oct. 23.  
"MRS. BOTTSFORD—Madame: I have received your letter of the 15th inst., stating that you are now in prison in Charleston on the charge of uttering dangerous and seditious sentiments; that you are held to bail in a considerable amount for your good behavior, and that you are unable to find assistance.

"I sympathize with your forlorn and desolate condition; a widow, in prison, and friendless; but cannot palliate the offence you have committed.

"You have offended against the peace and good order of the community where you were sojourning, and where you were obtaining employment which you found profitable. It was inconsistent for you to go thither if such were your feelings. If to cherish hate even in the inmost thoughts, is not according to the strict rule of morality, how heinous must be the crime of uttering words, that might become weapons fatal to the peace and quiet of the land where you are entertained and protected?

"But my object is not to blame, but, if possible, to do you a favor. I therefore counsel you to review your past conduct with calmness. Do not suffer your judgment to be warped by the false and dangerous doctrines of evil men; learn your errors; acknowledge them in a spirit of contrition before the authorities of Charleston, and I am convinced they will consider your needs, your widowhood and inexperience, and on receiving satisfactory assurance that you will depart from the State, the laws of which you have violated, they will release you.

"No other power can aid you in the distress you have brought upon yourself, and you must rely solely on the mercy of those who administer the laws you have broken, and the generosity of the people you have injured."

FERNANDO WOOD, Mayor."

My astonishment only equalled my indignation on reading this absurd letter. If the State seal had not been engraved on the paper I should have pronounced it a forgery. I could not believe a Mayor of New York could stoop to insult a helpless woman and uphold such villainous acts.

The weather was now getting colder, and the prison grew more and more dreary. There was to be an execution in the jail-yard and the gallows was built and a negro hung just before my window. The sights and sounds around the place I cannot describe.

I asked my counsel and the sheriff what they pretended they were keeping me there for; their foolish charges were of no consequence whatever: nothing could be construed into a crime except tampering with slaves; was there any one they could name that had ever seen or heard me talking to slaves? No, they could not say that they had heard of any that would hold themselves responsible for such a statement. Before long I received a letter saying that I had permission to leave in the next steamer bound for New York, and that if I was willing to leave a carriage would be sent for me, and my passage paid. Of course I was not sorry to leave Charleston; a close carriage was sent to the jail, and a vigilant policeman to take care of me; there was a great commotion around the steamer; they were sending back 60 poor Irish laborers that had come out in the steamer and had not been allowed to land; they had no provisions for their return voyage; the Minute Men, with terrible oaths, were threatening to cut their throats, if they dared put a foot on shore.

My attendant helped me aboard the ship, gave me my ticket, and turned away, as if in haste to leave. At a glance I saw I was booked for the deck passage with the sixty Irishmen. The Mayor was so kind as to pay for us all \$3 a head. I ran after the man. "Here, Sir," said I, "take this ticket back, I am not going on the deck." He said I should not leave the ship; I would be obliged to go as the Mayor ordered. I called for the captain, who came round and civilly heard what I had to say. He said he would send a messenger and propose some arrangement with the Mayor. I said I should never reach New York alive; I could not endure the cold and exposure; and hoped he would refuse to take me. "I will go back to jail again and wait until my friends send for me." Soon the man returned consulted a moment with the captain, and said to me, "You must go as you are ordered; the Mayor will not pay your passage in the cabin. I indignantly answered, I have not asked him to pay for my passage, or for anything else. I want no favors from him; I shall go on shore; my friends will come for me. I was making my way off the steamer, when the captain stopped me and offered me comfortable accommodations in the cabin if I was willing to leave Charleston, which offer I very gladly accepted. It is to Capt. Berry of the steamer *Columbia*, that I am indebted for my safe arrival in New York the last of November.

I trust I shall be able to cancel the debt of gratitude I owe to Mayor Macbeth and his worthy colleagues. I was safely protected in jail, for as long as they dared to keep me, although I was the most "audacious and defiant criminal" they had ever dealt with. Others had been tarred and feathered, whipped and hung, while they asserted their entire innocence of all Abolitionism; yet I was released, sent away, and \$3 was paid for my passage. If I have not returned formal thanks for all these favors, I have by no means forgotten them.

CATHERINE BOTTSFORD,

No. 157 Hudson street, New York.

#### CALLING FOR A VOTE.

The editor of the *North Alabamian* proclaims his dissatisfaction with the seceders' action, and being advised to "leave the state," replies:

"If all were to leave who are dissatisfied, we fear the remainder would soon have to leave or do worse, for they would have few left on whom they could safely rely for self-protection. It is a remarkable fact, and why it is we know not, that the substantial, physical force of the country—the hard-fisted, hard-working men, everywhere, who are expected to do all the fighting when their country calls—were from the beginning opposed to the ordinance of secession, and are becoming daily more and more dissatisfied with it."

The *Augusta Chronicle* (secession) says:

"There is no longer any reason why the people should not be recognised as a portion of the state. We advocate the submission of the constitution to the people, or a convention chosen by them for its consideration, as a measure of expediency. It is notorious that much dissatisfaction exists among the people of some portions of the confederacy."

The *Jackson Mississippian* asserts "the right of the people to decide whether or not they will live under the constitution which is being provided for them by the body in session at Montgomery."

The *Vicksburg Whig* insists that "the permanent (seceding) government must be submitted to the popular will, and woe be to the man who stands between the people and this inalienable right."

Our most respectable southern exchanges abound in such expressions of a growing suspicion on the part of the people that they are about to be cheated by their self-constituted masters.

ed masters

Evening Po

SOCIET

A society

purpose of p

and welfare

tions and all

inculcate, in

American cit

Samuel F.

Winslow and

The society h

are first to b

—N. Y. Eve

If the soci

word of God

and fifty-eigh

Chapter of M

The speedy

ington, Mar

evacuating l

the administ

doubt in my

in thirty day

made the ab

end of this v

than five thou

in bail, to rei

command the

it simply imp

to Fort Pick

large expend

ministration

quired.

Thus ends,

diate cause o

a few days w

We have n

litical news

ly disappoint

The South

Charleston y

indicates a d

bers to preci

solution. A

provisions w

mitted to obt

facilities be

be acted upo

ted Press is

dispatch rec

The latter a

the authorit

operations a

corresponden

nation has g

it will be sen

pears, w.15

Times.

"The Sew

of the Journ

"The Sew

call of a Nat

submitting t

peaceful dis

as may be d

Meanwhile,

ment shall

cy."

A SOUTHE

who resides i

al Intellig

"If the So

would proba

back. The

three to four

on butter, tw

half to twent

that sensibly

ing. Our rep

in this city,

youth go con

weapons is q

over a lad af

So-and-So, a

trade double

decreased.

or twenty-fiv

ways there w

Of course, th

become the b



and masters; and they are right, beyond a doubt.—N. Y. Evening Post.

#### SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING NATIONAL UNITY.

A society has recently been organized in this city for the purpose of promoting, as its constitution states, "the union and welfare of our common country, by addresses, publications and all other suitable means adapted to elucidate and inculcate, in accordance with the word of God, the duties of American citizens, especially in relation to slavery." Prof. Samuel F. B. Morse is President, and Messrs. Hubbard Winslow and Seth Bliss are Secretaries of the organization. The society proposes to issue a series of publications, which are first to be examined and recommended by a committee.—N. Y. Evening Post.

If the society intend to publish "in accordance with the word of God" let them give us honest expositions of the first and fifty-eighth Chapter of Isaiah, and of the twenty-fifth Chapter of Matthew, from the thirty first verse to the close.

**The speedy evacuation of Fort Pickens predicted.**—Washington, March 26th, 1861.—It is known that the subject of evacuating Fort Pickens has been under consideration by the administration. I have information which leaves no doubt in my mind that Fort Pickens will be evacuated within thirty days from this time, and for the same reasons that made the abandonment of Fort Sumter necessary. By the end of this week Fort Pickens will be invested by not less than five thousand men, with ten thousand volunteers within hail, to reinforce, if necessary. Powerful batteries will command the whole offing, the whole armament rendering it simply impossible to put reinforcements and supplies into Fort Pickens without an immense number of men and a large expenditure of money, neither of which does the administration possess, nor can command within the time required.

Thus ends, by the necessities of the case, the last immediate cause of collision at present threatening the peace of the country. This statement will doubtless be denied; but a few days will vindicate its truth.—N. Y. Herald.

We have not been accustomed to regard the Herald's political news as very authentic. But we should not be greatly disappointed, if this should prove true.

**The South Carolina State Convention** reassembled at Charleston yesterday, and the very first action taken by it indicates a disposition on the part of a portion of its members to precipitate the question of Fort Sumter to a speedy solution. A resolution was offered that all the supplies of provisions which Maj. Anderson has heretofore been permitted to obtain in Charleston be cut off, and that all mail facilities be denied to the garrison. The resolution is to be acted upon, to-day. The correspondent of the Associated Press is of the opinion that it will be voted down, but a dispatch received in Washington expresses a different view. The latter also states that Gen. Beauregard has notified the authorities at Montgomery that he is ready to commence operations against the fort. Meantime our Washington correspondent positively asserts that no order for the evacuation has gone forward, though there is little doubt that it will be sent this week. The visit of Col. Lamont, it appears, was partly on his own private account.—N. Y. Times.

**"The Seward policy."**—The Washington correspondent of the *Journal of Commerce* says:

"The Seward policy may prevail, and that is, for the call of a National Convention as soon as practicable, and submitting to it the expediency of a provision for the peaceful dissolution of the Union, by such boundary lines as may be determined upon, or for reconstructing the same. Meanwhile, Mr. Seward proposes that the Federal Government shall avoid even the appearance of a coercive policy."

**A SOUTHERNER ON SECESSION.**—A southern gentleman who resides in Augusta, Georgia, writes thus to the *National Intelligencer*.

"If the South were merely let alone for six months, we would probably try at the next general election to get back. The new tariff will open both eyes and pockets—three to four cents per pound on cheese, four to five cents on butter, two to two and a half cents on sugar, two and a half to twenty-five cents on tobacco—affect every one, and that sensibly. Prices have advanced, and are still ascending. Our regular army has one hundred and forty enlisted in this city, and as many in Savannah. Nine-tenths of our youth go constantly armed, and the common use of deadly weapons is quite disregarded. No control can be exercised over a lad after he is fourteen or fifteen. He becomes Mr. So-and-So, and acknowledges no master. While our free trade doubles our tariff, our postal facilities will also be decreased. Letter postage will probably be raised to ten or twenty-five cents, and off the immediate line of the railways there will probably be as much as one mail a week. Of course, therefore, we will like secession the better as we become the better acquainted with it."

#### MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

Lady Franklin had arrived in San Francisco on the 9th ult.

Missouri has legalized Bank suspensions within her borders.

Waldo H. Johnson has been elected U. S. Senator from Missouri.

The Rev. Mr. Van Dyke is preaching to the people of Charleston with acceptance.

The Hon. John Sherman has been elected U. S. Senator for Ohio, to succeed Gov. Chase.

The Hon. Joshua R. Giddings has been appointed Consul General for British America.

The term of service of officers in the New York State militia, is now limited to seven years.

The new code in Maryland has a stringent enactment against all secret societies of colored persons in that State.

The Philadelphia Banks resumed specie payment on Monday of last week, after a suspension of about four months.

The convention of Louisiana, has refused to submit the Secession Ordinance to the people, for ratification or rejection.

It is stated that Garibaldi is preparing for a landing in Illyria. Men are being recruited for his legion in Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles.

The official census of the United States has just been completed, and it shows a total of 31,429,891. Of these 3,951,801 are slaves.

Abson, the New Jersey wife poisoner, succeeded in stealing the march upon the hangman by cutting an artery, and bleeding himself to death.

The precise majority in Tennessee against any convention, is 11,976. The actual Union majority as indicated by an election of delegates, is 64,054.

Eight young gentlemen, whose parents are of the Sunny South, have signified their desire to bid adieu to Dartmouth college. Hope they will go.

The long standing dispute with Great Britain about the island of San Juan in Vancouver's Sound, is likely to be referred to Switzerland for arbitration.

Orville Gardner, the converted pugilist, is not insane as formerly stated. He has simply been overtasked, and, according to medical advice, is recruiting his strength at a quiet rural resort.

Missouri and Arkansas insist that they will not be "dragged out of the Union. The Convention of Arkansas has so decided by a vote of 89 to 35, while in that of Missouri, the Union majority was overwhelming.

The "Knights of the Golden Circle" proposes to carry California out of the Union. Of course the new confederacy would like to have a chance to tax the gold diggers of that State. Wouldn't they have "a sweet bite?"

Howell Cobb charged the nation only \$3.50 for varnishing James Buchanan. Why the latter gentleman was varnished, and how he was varnished, baffles even the funny man in the *Tribune*, to tell. Perhaps it was only his picture that was varnished.

The *Official Journal* of Naples announces the blockade of the citadel of Messina. Hostilities have commenced. All foreign vessels have left Messina, with the exception of those of America and England. Ratazzi had been elected President of the Italian Chamber of Deputies.

It appears that Gov. Morgan has become the co-laborer and fellow-engineer of his friend Thurlow Weed. They both went to Washington together to inform Mr. Lincoln whom he must appoint. We think that if they insist upon doing so, that several snubbed individuals will soon return to Albany.

The merchants of St. Louis complain that goods are brought into that city from New Orleans, free of duty. The Administration must do something to avert the further ravages upon business of such an operation as this. Border merchants have a superior claim to protection to border slavetraders.

The new Postage law recognizes seeds and cuttings as mailable matter in packages, and are to be charged with postage at the rate of one cent an ounce, when sent under 15.00 miles; and two cents an ounce when sent over that distance. The package not to exceed eight ounces in weight.

The latest novelty is the Society for the promotion of national Unity. Its head quarters are the Bible House. It inaugurates its mission by issuing pro slavery documents. This is what we should understand by "National Unity," because slavery is true to the doctrine of uniting the races, not for profit, but for the promotion of "Evangelical Christianity!" Sham!

Since our last miscellany was made up, the supply sloop *Isabella*, off Pensacola, has been seized by the Confederate State authorities. It appears that this was done under the provisions of a proclamation issued by Gen. Bragg, which prohibits all vessels from furnishing supplies to the war vessels off that harbor, under penalty of forfeiture to the new government.

The *Charlestown Mercury* of the 19th inst., has the following editorial paragraph:

"A colored woman, belonging to one of our citizens, has lately been convicted by her owner of borrowing money in his name, and also in the name of a clergyman of this city. She is supposed to have accomplices, and the public are hereby cautioned against imposition."

It appears from latest accounts that both houses of the Texas Legislature, have taken the oath of allegiance to the new

government, and that Gov. Houston and the Secretary of State, have retired from their offices and surrendered the archives. Gov. Houston has issued an appeal to the people denouncing the State Convention. [Later accounts deny that Gov. Houston has resigned, and say he acts the Secessionists at defiance.]

The *Independent* once more reminds its readers that Dr. Cheever did not go to Great Britain to represent the "Genuine Christian anti-slavery sentiment" of the New York Congregationalists. We might as well enlighten the *Independent* yet again, by stating that Dr. Cheever went to Great Britain to pitch into American slavery as it is apologized for by the "Genuine Christian anti-slavery men" of the New York Association, and to ask aid for the Church of the Puritans. The *Independent* should send that "merchant" along.

Mr. T. Butler King has gone to Europe on a secret mission from the Southern Confederacy, to prepare the way for Messrs. Yancey and Mann, the official Commissioners. Meantime, according to late European news, all Europe is profoundly moved against a government founded upon slavery alone; and Spain particularly, since one of the first acts of the Confederate States, in case of their recognition, would be the seizure of Cuba, is highly incensed.

#### Family Miscellany.

From The World We Live In.

#### THE WHITE DOVES OF THE CITY.

BY LIZZIE FLY.

Oh, why are ye here, ye white-winged doves,  
In the haunts of filth and sin?  
Are ye lured away from your native groves  
By the city's pomp and din?

Are ye so free from earthly taint,  
That ye all unscathed may go;  
While the life of man grows sick and faint,  
His days filled up with woe.

Ye flutter in at each noisome lane,  
And about the jostling street;  
Yet your pure, white plumes receive no stain,  
Unsoiled are your tiny feet.

Ye may hover near fierce scenes of strife,  
But no harm doth come to you,  
And the harshest tones of human life  
Ne'er change that low, soft "coo."

There are human souls, alas! too few!  
As pure as the white-winged dove;  
And the lanes of grief, they are groping through,  
Leave no stain on their robes of love.

Unharm'd they stray from the sheltered cot—  
From their native glens and groves;  
Dark chasms of sin defile them not—  
These, God! are thy white-winged doves.

Cincinnati, O.

For the Principal.

#### MY LITTLE BLACK SCHOLAR.

During my collegiate studies, more than forty years ago, I taught a district school, at A., Mass., four winters in succession. There was, among my scholars, a bright colored boy, I think about eight years of age. He was on perfectly good terms with his school-mates. None of the boys, or girls either, as I could perceive, "turned up their noses" at his complexion. They played together in harmony and good will.

One day there had come a thaw, and what young lads would call "capital snow-balling." In a five minute's recess, while the boys were out, there came, dash into the middle of the school-room, a snow-ball and pane from a window, broken to atoms. I perceived instantly, that the noise without was hushed, as if the young urchins expected a retribution. Shortly I gave my usual signal, when my scholars were all promptly in their seats. After a profound silence of about two minutes, I inquired, very little expecting an answer, "Who threw that snow-ball?" No one replied, and I repeated the question. Instantly the little colored lad was upon his feet, and said, "I threw it sir, I am sorry; one of the boys fired at me, and firing back again, I broke the window. I am sorry sir, I won't do so again."

"You fine little fellow," said I, "you have set an example to the school; you have honestly owned the truth, which is all I ask. I shall neither punish nor report you, and I will see that the window is repaired, which shall end the matter."

It was a rule of the district, that, if a scholar broke a window, or did other damage to the school-house, he should be reported to the Trustees, and the parent or guardian of the delinquent should repair the injury. In this case, I told my little friend and the school, that we would meet the exigency ourselves, and secure him from the apprehension of blame or punishment in the family where he resided. A scholar, at my request, passed round a hat, and



older ones immediately threw in a cent each, enough to cover the expense. The glass procured, and an Uncle, where I boarded, being a mechanic, went over in the morning, and glazed the window. Thus the affair ended, and I presume was soon forgotten by the school, but never by me. I can now, after more than forty years, see that honest little fellow's face before me, vivid as ever; and I never think of, except to love him.

But Brother Goodell, one object of this little sketch is, to ask your little readers and older ones, too, 'If any of them think that my little black scholar deserved to be a slave?' I am willing they should ask Rev. Mr. VAN DYKE, or Rev. N. ADAMS, D. D. 'If it would have been right to enslave and make a brute of that little boy?' But there are thousands of both little boys and girls, as bright and honest as my little scholar, holden in slavery, and treated worse than pigs in a farmer's sty! Many of them, too, have been cruelly whipped, and some even killed, for a matter far more trifling than breaking a pane in the window.

M. THACHER.

Fort Covington, N. Y., March 14, 1861.

#### SUPERIOR PEOPLE.

It is curious how many men soothe themselves and avoid coming down, or mitigate the pain of doing so, by secretly cherishing the belief that in some one little respect they are different from, and higher than, all the rest of their race. And it is wonderful how such a reflection has power to break one's fall, so to speak. You don't much mind being only a common place man in all other respects, if only there be one respect in which you can fondly believe you are superior to every body else. A very little thing will suffice. A man is taller than anybody else in the town or parish; he has longer hair; he can walk faster; he is the first person who ever crossed the new bridge; when the Queen passed near she bowed to him individually; he was the earliest in the neighborhood who got the perforated postage stamps; he has the swiftest horse in the district; he has the largest cabbages; he has the oldest watch; one Smith spells his name as no other Smith was ever known to do. It is quite wonderful how far it is possible for men to find reason for cherishing in their heart a deep-seated belief that in something or other they stand on a higher platform than all the remainder of mankind. Few men live who do not imagine that in some respect they stand alone in the world, or stand first. I have seen people quite proud of the unexampled disease under which they were suffering. It was none of the common maladies, that the people round about, suffered from. I have known a country woman boast, with undisguised elation, that the doctor had more difficulty in pulling out her tooth than he ever before had, in the case of mortal man.—*Recollections of a Country Parson.*

#### NEW SILK WORM SUBSTITUTE FOR COTTON.

The following is condensed for the *American Agriculturist*, from our foreign files, the information appears to be reliable, and is given without comment by Dr. Lindley in the *Gardner's Chronicle*. Here is, perhaps, a new field of enterprise opened—though we are not ready to endorse all the new discoveries of our French co-laborers. The account runs as follows:

In March, 1859, a request was made of the French Emperor to provide the means of making an experiment on a large scale for the rearing of a new kind of silkworm, which lives in the open air on a very hardy plant, the *ailante*, and produces two crops a year of a strong silky fibre, which has been used for ages past in China to make clothes for the great mass of the people. The authority was immediately granted, and the result, as now published, surpasses all expectations. More than three-fourths of the worms produced excellent cocoons, and it is now fully ascertained that the new worm gives a profit of one hundred per cent., and often much more, whereas the mulberry silk worm is considered very successful when it makes a return of fifteen per cent., on the capital employed. The silk of the *ailante* is of inferior quality, well adapted for coarse fabrics, and will form an excellent substitute for cotton, of which France annually imports 162,900,000 pounds from the United States. M. Guerin Meneville, who was the first to introduce the new silk into France, proposes to call it *ailan-*

*tine*. He is now studying the best means of promoting the production and manufacture of the new silk, which he thinks will ere long supply the chief clothing of the people. The *ailante* on which the worm feeds is the *ailantus glandulosa*, one of the hardiest of trees, and very common in American cities and towns.—*American Agriculturist*

#### MODERN SPIRITUALISM FROM CHINA.

Below will be found an interesting account of the origin of modern spiritualism. Dr. Dean's book on China we think remarkably interesting and instructive.

The third class in China are called the Taurists or the Rationalists of the empire. *Tau* signifies reason, and to this sect the Rationalists of Germany are probably indebted for their creed. The founder of Tauism, called Lautsz, was contemporary with Confucius, with whom he had some personal acquaintance. He was born in the Chau dynasty, B. C. 530, and lived in a retired place, at a distance from court in the dominions of Prince Tsi. The system of Tauism is sustained by abstruse speculations of a mystic philosophy, which fills all nature with demons and genii, who constantly influence the fate of men. They furnish, not only the elements, but also the forms of modern spiritualism, with the accompaniments of rapping and table-turnings. In China may be seen in the markets and public places mediums who, for a consideration, may be consulted in relation to the future state, and departed friends, and passing events in foreign parts. Modern spiritualists have embraced a creed of ancient origin, and there is a fabulous account, on Chinese record, that its founder not only lived more than five hundred years before Christ, but that he "was born with a white beard, having been eighty years in his mother's womb, and lived to be eight hundred and eight years old; and the last that was seen of him, he was going westward, riding on a blue cow!"

#### THE SOCIAL HORROR.

An untidy woman! little soap and much perfume. Plenty of jewelry and lack of strings and buttons. Silks and laces, and tattered under-clothes. Diamond rings and soiled collar. Feathers and flowers, and battered cap frill. Silk stockings and shabby boots. Who has not seen her? If you are a person of courage, enter her dressing room. Make your way over the carpet, through mismatched slippers, tip-pets, belts, ribbons, hair pins, pictorial magazines, fashion prints and unpaid bills, and look vainly around for a chair that is sufficiently free from dust to sit down upon. Look at the dingy muslin window curtains, the questionable bed quilt and pillow cases, the unfreshness of everything your eye falls upon.

Open the closet door, and see the piles of dresses, all wanting the stitch in time, heaped pell mell upon the pegs; see the band-boxes without covers, and all the horrible paraphernalia of a lazy, vivid, inefficient, vacant, idealless female monstrosity, who will, of course, be chosen out of a bevy of practical, good, common sense girls, by some man who prides himself on "his knowledge of woman," as his "help meet" for life! I used the word "monstrosity" advisedly: for even in the cell of a prison I have seen wretched females trying, with woman's beautiful instinct, to brighten and beautify the bare walls with some rude colored print. Thank Heaven! the untidy woman is the exception, not the rule. Would we could say the same of the untidy man.

FANNY FERN.

#### NEVER DECEIVE CHILDREN.

The importance of truth, without deception in the management of children, is illustrated by the anecdote narrated in the following paragraph from a New York paper: "Two small boys met on the side-walk, and after some minutes spent in conversation, one remarked to the other that some little thing might be obtained if he could procure a few cents from his parents. 'But,' said the other, 'I don't need any money to obtain it, for my mother told me I should have it at such a time.' 'Poh!' said the first, 'my mother has promised me so many times, and I did not get it, and I do not think you will either. Our mother only tells us so to get rid of us, and I think it will be so with yours.' 'What, my mother tell a lie,' exclaimed the little fellow, and immediately left his companion with a countenance filled with indignation. What a lesson should this afford to all parents, guardians and those who have the care of youth."

#### SECRET SOCIETIES.

The Iowa Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, at its last session, adopted the following paper:

We are more than ever convinced that the duties we owe to God and Christianity can not be performed by any man who is in fellowship with secret oath-bound societies; and this antagonism is not merely or mainly on account of the character of the initiatory obligations; nor even because of the secrets that may be held sacred. All these are sinful, and to be condemned by all Christian people, yet if the oaths were all dispensed with, and no secrets held by any, the principles maintained, the character assumed, and the results following the prevalence of such societies, must forever preclude Christian people from holding fellowship with them. They are selfish, favoring a system of caste, multiplying artificial distinctions, and thus interfering with the divine plan of benevolence, which seeks to equalize humanity by a law of universal brotherhood. Then, in some cases, moreover, by their ritual ceremonial services, they counterfeit religion; assuming to approach God with a man-made form of worship; which, being imperfect in itself and associated with the vindication of ungodly principles, becomes in fact a sacrilegious mockery. Finally, wherever professing Christians become devoted to the interests of secret societies, accepting their principles, and participating in their religious mockeries, their soul of sympathy is absorbed, leaving for the church of God and the cause of Christianity, a mere remnant and a wreck. We therefore agree to recommend to our next General Conference, that they maintain in full force our present testimony and law on that subject.

In an advertisement by a railway company of some uncalled for goods, the letter L has, by an accident, dropped from the word lawful, and it reads now: "people to whom these packages are directed, are requested to come forward and pay the awful charges on the same."

LITTLE TROUBLES.—It is little troubles that wear the heart out. It is easier to throw a bomb-shell a mile than a feather—even with artillery.

A recent philosopher discovers a method to avoid being dunned! "How—how—how?" everybody asks. Never run in debt.

#### WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the *Principia*: FOR CASH ONLY.  
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50..... Postage 32 cts.  
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00 Postage 32 cts.  
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 50..... Postage 16 cts.

#### OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FOR THE MILLIONS, INCLUDING

I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.  
II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.  
III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.  
IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.  
With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. Also a summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinions*, collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. AN APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions, and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers, &c.

PRICES OF "Our National Charters."		Delivered at the Office; or sent by private conveyance, or express, as ordered, at the expense of the purchaser.	
By mail, postage prepaid, by the Publisher.		Single copy	12 cents.
Single copy	15 cents.	For 4 copies	38 "
For 4 copies	50 "	9 "	75 "
9 "	1.00	13 "	1.00
12 "	1.30	20 "	1.50
20 "	2.00	28 "	2.00
31 "	3.00	46 "	3.00
		100 "	6.00

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the *Principia*, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH, always in advance.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be paid at our Post-Office in advance, so that we cannot answer orders, as above, without having received the postage money, as well as the price of the publication.

Also, for sale as above,  
**Spooner's Unconstitutionality of Slavery.**  
In paper covers, price 75 cents, postage 13 cts.; in cloth, \$1.00, postage 13c.

—We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, except those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.